

## **REMARKS**

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated February 24, 2005. A diligent effort has been made to respond to all of the objections and rejections contained in the Office Action and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 6-9; 14; 17-22; 27-35; 41-43 and 45 are pending in this application. By this Amendment After Final, previously pending claims 10-13; 15-16; 23-26; 36-40; 44 and 46-52 have now been cancelled, without prejudice.

The Final Office Action indicated that claims 44 and 45 were allowable if re-written in the independent form. Specifically, the Office Action stated “The voicemail system as taught by Smith et al is connected by a connection initiated by the wireless device. It is not obvious to modify the system of Smith et al for the voicemail system receives the request and initiates a voice connection from the voicemail system to the wireless device.” This claimed subject matter – the voice mail system receiving the request and initiating a voice connection to the wireless device – has now been added to both of the remaining independent claims 6 and 18. These claims, therefore, should be in condition for allowance.

The remaining claim cancellations and amendments have been made in order to overcome the numerous 35 USC 112 objections/rejections raised in the Final Office Action. It is believed that by this Amendment, all of these objections/rejections have either been rendered moot (in the case of certain claims been cancelled) or overcome by modifications to the claim language.

Applicants specifically traverse the 35 USC 102 and 103 rejections set forth in the Final Office action, and reserve the right to continue to prosecute the claims as previously presented. Applicants do not concede any of the points raised in the Final Office Action with respect to the application of the alleged prior art to the previously pending claims.

The Office Action continues to raise an objection to the drawings, but it is still not clear from the Office Action what problem is being raised by the objection. The objection now states that “proper legends, for example, items 110b, 130 Fig. 1, item 240 Fig. 2, item 312, 313, 316 Fig. 5 (this is not intended to be a complete listing), were missing.” Applicants cannot amend the drawings at this point without further clarification from the Examiner as to the precise nature of the drawing objection. The “items” referred to in the objection are shown and labeled on the drawings, and discussed in the specification. Applicants request, once again, that the Examiner clarify this objection in a way that it becomes possible to respond to or amend the drawings.

Finally, applicants specifically request that the Examiner consider the IDS submitted on August 29, 2002 and received at the USPTO on September 3, 2002. The 1449 submitted with this IDS has not been returned to the applicants in this application as having been considered by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

JONES DAY

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David B. Cochran", written over a horizontal line.

David B. Cochran  
(Reg. No. 39,142)

Jones Day

North Point, 901 Lakeside Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
(216) 586-7506